# CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name: 287 Fence Construction

**Proposed** 

Implementation Date: June 2013
Proponent: Thomas Miller

**Location:** Township 6S Range 2W Section 16

County: Madison

Trust: Common Schools

# I. TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION

The proposed Improvements Request is for the construction of a fence along the north side of Highway 287 to complete the fencing along the border with the highway and improve containment of livestock.

### II. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

# 1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED:

Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.

Montana Natural Heritage Program – Animal species of Concern Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks – Julie Cunningham, Wildlife Biologist

# 2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:

None

#### 3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

Grant Improvements – Allow for the construction of the fence.

No Action – Do not allow for the construction of the fence, leaving the parcel as is.

# III. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

- RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.
- Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading.
- Enter "NONE" If no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.

# 4. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE:

Consider the presence of fragile, compactable or unstable soils. Identify unusual geologic features. Specify any special reclamation considerations. Identify any cumulative impacts to soils.

The soils are comprised of the Woodhall-Blaine-Hapgood complex, which is a well drained stony loam. No adverse effects would be expected.

# 5. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION:

Identify important surface or groundwater resources. Consider the potential for violation of ambient water quality standards, drinking water maximum contaminant levels, or degradation of water quality. Identify cumulative effects to water resources.

No effect on water quality, quantity and distribution.

#### 6. AIR QUALITY:

What pollutants or particulate would be produced? Identify air quality regulations or zones (e.g. Class I air shed) the project would influence. Identify cumulative effects to air quality.

No cumulative effects to air quality would be expected.

# 7. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY:

What changes would the action cause to vegetative communities? Consider rare plants or cover types that would be affected. Identify cumulative effects to vegetation.

The fence line would be cleared of vegetation and boulders with equipment. No lasting effects would be expected

# 8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS:

Consider substantial habitat values and use of the area by wildlife, birds or fish. Identify cumulative effects to fish and wildlife.

The area in which this parcel is location is traveled by pronghorns, elk and deer. Fencing can limit the mobility of these species and be potentially life threatening. If the fencing is constructed to wildlife friendly standards the limitations and hazards to pronghorns, elk and deer can be reduced.

# 9. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES:

Consider any federally listed threatened or endangered species or habitat identified in the project area. Determine effects to wetlands. Consider Sensitive Species or Species of special concern. Identify cumulative effects to these species and their habitat.

The Montana Natural Heritage Program lists two birds, as possible species of concern in the Township and Range in which the parcel is located. The Great Blue Heron and the Brewer's Sparrow, neither species should be affected by this project.

# 10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES:

Identify and determine effects to historical, archaeological or paleontological resources.

No cultural resources have been identified on the track.

### 11. AESTHETICS:

Determine if the project is located on a prominent topographic feature, or may be visible from populated or scenic areas. What level of noise, light or visual change would be produced? Identify cumulative effects to aesthetics.

The fence would be visible from Highway 287. No cumulative effects to aesthetics would be expected.

# 12. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR OR ENERGY:

Determine the amount of limited resources the project would require. Identify other activities nearby that the project would affect. Identify cumulative effects to environmental resources.

None

# 13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA:

List other studies, plans or projects on this tract. Determine cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of current private, state or federal actions in the analysis area, and from future proposed state actions in the analysis area that are under MEPA review (scoped) or permitting review by any state agency.

None

# IV. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION

- RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.
- Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading.
- Enter "NONE" If no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.

### 14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY:

Identify any health and safety risks posed by the project.

Currently the livestock containment has been implemented using a temporary electric fence. While it has been generally effective, livestock have escaped and encroached on highway 287 each season. A completed permanent fence line would be expected to be more secure.

### 15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURE ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION:

Identify how the project would add to or alter these activities.

None

# 16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT:

Estimate the number of jobs the project would create, move or eliminate. Identify cumulative effects to the employment market.

None

# 17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES:

Estimate tax revenue the project would create or eliminate. Identify cumulative effects to taxes and revenue.

None

# 18. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES:

Estimate increases in traffic and changes to traffic patterns. What changes would be needed to fire protection, police, schools, etc.? Identify cumulative effects of this and other projects on government services

None

### 19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS:

List State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, and other zoning or management plans, and identify how they would affect this project.

None

# 20. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES:

Identify any wilderness or recreational areas nearby or access routes through this tract. Determine the effects of the project on recreational potential within the tract. Identify cumulative effects to recreational and wilderness activities.

None

# 21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING:

Estimate population changes and additional housing the project would require. Identify cumulative effects to population and housing.

None

# 22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES:

Identify potential disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities.

None

# 23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY:

How would the action affect any unique quality of the area?

None

# 24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:

Estimate the return to the trust. Include appropriate economic analysis. Identify potential future uses for the analysis area other than existing management. Identify cumulative economic and social effects likely to occur as a result of the proposed action.

The fence would enable more efficient management of the livestock on this parcel of school Trust Land leased for grazing.

	EA Checklist Prepared By:	Name:	Katie Svoboda/s/	Date:	6/3/2013	
		Title:	Bozeman Unit Office Mana	ger		
V. FINDING						
25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED: Allow for the construction of the fence, with stipulations as follows;						
The top to be less than 42 inches in height.						
The bottom wire to be smooth and greater than 16 inches in height.						
•						
26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS: No significant impacts would be expected.						
27. NEED FOR FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:						
			$\neg$			
	EIS		More Detailed EA	X No Further	r Analysis	
ı		T				
	EA Checklist Approved By:	Name:	Hoyt Richards			
		Title:	CLO Area Manager			
	Signature: Hoy	Hoyt Richards /s/		<b>Date</b> : 6/4/	/2013	